



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/542,477 04/04/00 CHUNG

W TTX0164-US

□

□

EXAMINER

QMO2/0410

MICHAEL D BEDNAREK
CROWELL & MORING LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2595

SOLAK, T
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3746
DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/542,477	CHUNG, WANG CHENG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy P. Solak	3746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 4 recites the step of "preparing an electric pump and an inflatable product having a built-in socket and a built-in battery case". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this step in the claim. This limitation would be clearer if recited in the preamble of the claim.
4. Claim 6 recites the step "reversely connecting" rendering the claim indefinite. It is not clear to which "connection" is being reversed, the pump's or the socket's?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valenti (5,057,819), in view of Chaffee (5,367,726). Valenti teaches most of the limitations of the claim including an inflatable body 10, a socket 16 built in the inflatable body and a battery case 22 for

receiving batteries. Although Valenti teaches a socket for inflating the body, he does not disclose a detachable electric pump. Chaffee disclosing an air mattress 10, specifically teaches a battery powered detachable (column 2, lines 27-36) air pump 20 for inflating the mattress. Chaffee teaches the detachable battery operated pump advantageously increased the efficiency of the unit (column 6, lines 53-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the pump disclosed by Chaffee, in the inflatable body taught by Valenti, to have advantageously increased the unit's efficiency.

7. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valenti, in view of Chaffee (both previously mentioned). Although Valenti teaches most of the limitations of the claims including a method of loading batteries (see Figure 3) into a built-in battery case, he does not teach connecting a pump to a socket. Chaffee disclosing an air mattress, specifically teaches a method of connecting a battery operated electric pump to a socket (column 2, lines 33-36). Chaffee teaches this method advantageously enhanced the portability of the unit (column 1, lines 19-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method taught by Chaffee, with the inflatable body disclosed by Valenti, to have advantageously enhanced the portability of the unit.

Although Chaffee and Valenti teach most of the limitations of the claims including a method for connecting a battery operated pump to an inflatable body, they do not disclose using the built-in batteries. It was old and well known in the art that using an existing power supply advantageously reduced the manufacturing cost. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electrical wiring at the time the invention was made to have used

the built-in batteries to inflate the body disclosed by Valenti, to have advantageously reduced manufacturing costs.

With respect to claim 5, although Valenti teaches most of the limitations of the claim including a inflatable body with a socket, he does not disclose using the socket to deflate the body. Chaffee disclosing an air mattress, specifically teaches a method of separating an electric pump from a socket to directly deflate the body (column 4, lines 20-30). Chaffee teaches this method advantageously increased the utility of the unit (column 1, lines 30-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method disclosed by Chaffee, with the inflatable body disclosed by Valenti, to have advantageously increased the utility of the unit.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valenti, in view of Chaffee (both previously mentioned), in further view of Owen et al. (4,678,014). Although Valenti teaches most of the limitations of the claim including an inflatable body with a built-in battery case, he does not disclose a method of reversing the motor to deflate the body. Owen et al. disclosing an inflator/deflator, specifically teach a method of deflating a body by removing the pump and reinstalling it backwards to deflate the body (column 5, lines 50-55). Owen et al. teach this method advantageously reduced the manufacturing cost (column 5, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method taught by Owen et al, with the inflatable body disclosed by Valenti, to have advantageously reduced the manufacturing costs.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Price (5,606,756) teaches an air mattress with a built-in battery case used to supply power to a pump (column 17, lines 34-36).
- Klearman et al. (5,584,084) teach an air bed with a separate pump connected to a socket.
- Sexton (5,068,933) teaches an inflatable body with a built-in battery case powering an air pump.
- Suzuki et al. (5,216,778) teach a socket with electrodes.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy P. Solak whose telephone number is 703-308-6197. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy S. Thorpe can be reached on 703-308-0102. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7763 for regular communications and 703-305-3588 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0861.



tps

April 7, 2001



Timothy S. Thorpe
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700